**Chapter 3: Priestly Additions in the Account of Solomon’s Temple Construction (1 Kgs 6–8)**

A comparison between the MT and LXX in the chapters describing the construction of the Temple (1 Kgs 6–8) reveals several notable differences. Among these, a series of additions stand out, written in a style reminiscent of the language and ideology of the Priestly (P) and Holiness (H) sources in the Pentateuch. These additions are primarily found in MT 1 Kings 6–8, though similar insertions, reflecting similar Priestly conceptions, also appear in the LXX version of chapter 7. While there may be other instances in the Book of Kings where short Priestly-style additions were incorporated,[[1]](#footnote-2) it seems that 1 Kgs 6–8 underwent more extensive elaboration due to their content. The aim of these additions is to establish a connection between the account of Solomon’s construction of the Jerusalem Temple and the Priestly narrative in the Pentateuch, especially the sections detailing the construction of the tabernacle and its associated worship practices.

Most of these Priestly-like texts are absent from certain textual witnesses, indicating that they were likely added at a later stage. However, several similar texts are present in all the main extant versions. Philological and literary analysis supports the hypothesis that these texts represent additions, likely introduced during the final stages of composition or during transmission. Yet, it appears that these additions were incorporated relatively early, possibly before the divergence of the primary textual branches (LXX and MT). In this chapter, I will examine all the Priestly additions found in chapters 6–8. Some of these are revealed through an analysis of the textual variations, while others are consistently documented across all extant witnesses. A portion of this material has already been identified and analyzed in previous studies.[[2]](#footnote-3) Here, I aim to highlight both a few additional Priestly-like texts in these chapters that have not received sufficient attention in previous studies and the connection between this phenomenon of Priestly additions in Kings and the Book of Chronicles. This link to Chronicles aligns with other late layers of the Book of Kings examined in earlier chapters, revealing a notable affinity with the style and themes characteristic of Chronicles.

**1. YHWH’s words to Solomon: 1 Kgs 6:11–14**

One of the most prominent differences among the textual witnesses for the pericope describing Solomon’s Temple (1 Kgs 6–8) is the passage in MT 1 Kgs 6:11–14, which is absent from the Septuagint.[[3]](#footnote-4) This passage contains God’s word to Solomon (verses 11–13), interrupting the detailed description of the Temple’s construction. It is introduced abruptly, without a narrative context or explanation for why and how God appeared to Solomon and spoke to him. After this brief passage, the text returns to the construction of the Temple with a resumptive repetition (*Wiederaufnahme*) in verse 14 (marked in bold), which reconnects the reader to the section that begins with the description of the cedar coverings (v. 9), as shown here:

Text

Verse 15, which describes the overlaying of the interior walls of the house with cedar boards, naturally follows the detailed account of the Temple’s construction in 1 Kings 6:1–10, particularly the mention of paneling the house with cedar wood in verses 9–10. Given this logical sequence, the omission of verses 11–14 in the Septuagint cannot be plausibly attributed to a deliberate act by the translator,[[4]](#footnote-5) nor can it be explained by a scribal error in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Instead, it is more likely that MT 1 Kgs 6:11–14 is a later addition to the Hebrew text, which would account for its absence in the LXX.[[5]](#footnote-6) This hypothesis is supported by several factors. First, these verses do not form a coherent narrative unit. The circumstances surrounding the divine speech are unclear, and there is no mention of Solomon’s response. Second, the text in 1 Kings 9:2, which mentions that God “appeared to Solomon *a second time*, as He had appeared to him at Gibeon,” clearly refers to the divine revelation in Gibeon (1 Kgs 3). This implies no awareness of any divine communication with Solomon in 1 Kings 6.

Some scholars have suggested that this passage belongs to the Deuteronomistic editorial stratum or a late Deuteronomistic hand.[[6]](#footnote-7) However, the language used here is characteristic of neither the Book of Kings nor typical Deuteronomistic works. Instead, it closely resembles the language of P and H strata in the Pentateuch, and the book of Ezekiel.[[7]](#footnote-8) Notably, the idiom ללכת + בחקתי (“to walk in my statutes”) and the term משפטי (“my ordinances”) in verse 12 are prominent H expressions.[[8]](#footnote-9) In addition, the concluding verse of the speech, “I will dwell among the children of Israel” (ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל; v. 13), reflects the central Priestly concept of God’s physical dwelling among the Israelites through His presence in the Temple (as seen in Exodus 25:8, “and have them make me a sanctuary, so that I may dwell among them,” and cf. Exod 29:46).[[9]](#footnote-10) As is well known, the Deuteronomistic stratum in Kings promotes the opposite idea: that it is God’s “name” that resides in the Temple, rather than God Himself. This perspective is expressed in 1 Kgs 8:27, “Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you.”[[10]](#footnote-11) The passage in 1 Kgs 6, therefore, seems to have been authored by a scribe deeply familiar with Priestly concepts and terminology, including both P and H traditions. Moreover, this author appears to be aware of the narrative in Samuel, as the first part of verse 11 (“then I will establish my promise with you, which I made to your father David”) echoes God’s words to David through Nathan in 2 Sam 7.[[11]](#footnote-12) By embedding God’s words within the account of the Temple’s construction, this scribe aimed to impart a unique message, intentionally diverging from the themes presented in Samuel and Kings. The divine speech in 1 Kings 6 introduces a pivotal condition, closely aligning with Leviticus 26:1–13 (cf. also Exod 29:45):[[12]](#footnote-13)

TEXT

This passage thus makes the Temple’s permanency conditional even before its construction has begun. Its author, writing obviously during the post-Destruction period, sought to justify the events by addressing a caution found in Scripture itself.[[13]](#footnote-14) It seems that the scribe inserted God’s words to Solomon at this exact point in verses 11–14, prompted by the following verses, which describe the construction of the Holy of Holies “in the innermost part of the House …” (1 Kgs 6:19), where the ark of the covenant and cherubim, symbolizing the divine presence, would reside.[[14]](#footnote-15)

**2. Bringing the Ark to the Temple: 1 Kgs 8:1-5**

A distinct Priestly style, which is also evident in the differences between the MT and LXX, is apparent in the narrative of bringing the Ark from the City of David to the Temple in 1 Kgs 8:1–5. The comparison of these two major versions in the table below reveals that the Septuagint preserves a shorter version of this story than the MT, except for the first verse, where the Septuagint actually provides a more elaborate account. In this place, there is also a fragmentary testimony from Qumran (4QKgs [4Q54]), which I reference in the footnotes only when it offers significant insights:

TEXT

Charles F. Burney attributed the lengthy plus in the first part of verse 1 in the LXX to the work of a Greek translator.[[15]](#footnote-16) However, the evident Hebraic characteristics in some expressions within this half-verse suggest the presence of a Hebrew *Vorlage*.[[16]](#footnote-17) This half-verse might also preserve the earlier reading, which would then have been later omitted by a scribe who was uncomfortable with the notion that Solomon only brought the Ark into the Temple thirteen years after completing the Temple, after he had finished building his own house (a total of twenty years from the commencement of his construction projects). The conclusion of chapter 7 and the beginning of chapter 8 in the MT create the impression that the Ark was brought into the Temple immediately upon its completion (1 Kgs 7:51), although MT 1 Kgs 6:38–7:1 (LXX 6:1d; 7:38) may align with the chronology described in the LXX version of 8:1.

In the following, the MT presents a more expansive text, once again suggesting a later stage in the text's development. When the expansions are removed, what remains is a logical and natural sequence that likely preserves the ancient narrative of bringing the Ark from the City of David to Solomon’s Temple in the month of Ethanim. Similar to 1 Kgs 6:11–13, the additional material in the MT includes linguistic features characteristic of the Priestly strata of the Pentateuch, seemingly intended to mimic the style of the Priestly Tabernacle account in the Torah.[[17]](#footnote-18) In MT v. 1, the words את כל ראשי המטות נשיאי האבות (“and all the heads of the tribes, the leaders of the ancestral houses of the Israelites”) were added to describe the participants of the procession.[[18]](#footnote-19) The termמטות (“tribes”), ראשי מטות (“heads of the tribes”), נשיא (“leader, prince”) are all characteristic of P but rare in other biblical texts.

The second verse likely originally mentioned only the ancient local name of the month, Ethanim, as the time specification for this event, as evidenced by the LXX version.[[19]](#footnote-20) However, the additional stratum in the MT clarifies this for later readers with the phrase הוא החֹדש השביעי (“which is the seventh month”). This addition not only simplifies the ancient date but also introduces new content by associating the bringing of the Ark into the Temple, and the festival celebrating this event (1 Kgs 8:65), with the Sukkot festival of the seventh month as described in Priestly texts. Only H (Lev 23:33–44) and P strata (Num 29:12–39) provide a fixed date for the festival of the seventh month, whereas Deuteronomy and other non-P sources do not specify a particular date. The verses in Exodus offer a more flexible timeframe: בצאת השנה באספך את מעשיך מן השדה (“at the end of the year, when you gather in from the field the fruit of your labor,” Exod 23:16) or תקופת השנה (“at the turn of the year,” Exod 34:22). Similarly, Deuteronomy 16:13 states באספך מגרנך ומיקבך (“when you have gathered in the produce from your threshing floor and your wine press”).[[20]](#footnote-21)

Additional Priestly-like elements appear in vv. 4–5 of chapter 8. In the LXX version of 1 Kgs 8:3, “the priests carried the Ark.” The scribe of the MT, familiar with Priestly texts, repeats this information in verse 4, but rewrites it to include “and the Levites.” This addition likely reflects an intent to emphasize that it was the Levites, in accordance with Priestly regulations (Numbers 3–4, 7:4–9, 18:1–7), who were responsible for carrying the Ark.[[21]](#footnote-22) Verse 5 in the LXX also offers a more concise text than the MT. Instead of the simpler phrase וכל ישראל (“and all Israel”)*,* the MT uses the more redundant וכל עדת ישראל הנועדים עליו אתו (“the congregation of Israel who had assembled before him with him”). Here, the terms עדה (“congregation”) andהנועדים (“assembled”) are characteristic of Priestly language (cf. יעד על “gathered together against” in Num 14:35; 16:11).[[22]](#footnote-23)

**3. How Many Days Did the Celebrations Last? 1 Kgs 8:65–66**

A similar addition in the MT, which links the celebration of the ark’s transfer with the festival of Sukkot and the following day of solemn assembly, appears to be found in MT 1 Kgs 8:65 as well. In this place, the LXX presents a shorter version regarding the timing, while Chronicles follows the expansion in the MT, offering a different approach to address this deliberate identification with P and H traditions. The figure below compares the three versions, with the duration of the celebrations highlighted in bold:

TEXT

The LXX version of 3 Kgdms 8 is shorter and clearer, and likely reflects an earlier tradition regarding the calculation of time. In this account, the celebration of bringing the Ark lasted seven days (v. 65), and on the eighth day, Solomon sent the people away (v. 66).[[23]](#footnote-24) This chronology aligns also with the Deuteronomic concept of the festival of Sukkot (Deut 16:13–15). In contrast, the MT version in 1 Kgs 8 is more cumbersome, describing a celebration that lasted seven days, followed by another seven days, explicitly totaling “fourteen days” (v. 65). Afterward, Solomon sent the people away on the eighth day (v. 66). This awkward doubling of the celebration period, “seven days and seven days, fourteen days,” along with the subsequent verse where the people are sent home on the eighth day, indicates that the second “seven days” and the total are secondary. As previously noted, the MT identifies the Ark celebration with the Sukkot festival, aligning it precisely with the Priestly calendar (MT 1 Kgs 8:2). However, the statement that Solomon sent the people away on the eighth day creates a conflict with the commandment in the H and P texts of the Pentateuch, which designate the eighth day as a sacred assembly and an additional Sabbath (Lev 23:36, 39; Num 29:35-39; cf. Neh. 8:14). The mention of an additional seven days appears to be an attempt to reconcile this potential contradiction with Pentateuchal law.[[24]](#footnote-25) In this case, according to the glossator, the people’s departure on the eighth day probably occurs after the second set of “seven days,” that is, at the end of the month, thereby avoiding any conflict with the obligation to observe the sacred assembly.[[25]](#footnote-26)

The Book of Chronicles addresses this issue, likely recognizing the same difficulty but offering a different solution. The Chronicler may have understood the phrase ביום השמיני (“on the eighth day”) as referring to the day of the solemn assembly according to the Torah’s laws. Consequently, he interpreted the redundant phrase in the MT, “seven days and seven days,” as referring to seven days of altar dedication, which took place *before* the Sukkot festival, followed by the seven days of Sukkot itself, beginning on the 15th of the month. The Chronicler explicitly mentions that on the eighth day, the people held a solemn assembly (2 Chr 7:9), and only on the ninth day, following the holiday—on the twenty-third day of the seventh month—did Solomon send the people away to their homes (2 Chr 7:10).[[26]](#footnote-27)

Many scholars have suggested that the MT reading “seven days and seven days, fourteen days” is influenced by or based on Chronicles.[[27]](#footnote-28) However, this assumption is flawed, as the most problematic phrase in the MT, “on the eighth day,” (1 Kgs 8:66) has not been corrected to align with the account in Chronicles. If we accept the explanation proposed here, which demonstrates throughout the chapter that various versions of the Book of Kings already contained additions influenced by Priestly texts and the Pentateuch as a whole, we can infer a more conventional progression of the LXX and MT versions of Kings, as well as Chronicles, moving from the shortest to the longest. The LXX in this verse reflects a shorter version that underwent a brief, though not entirely clear, expansion in the version reflected in the MT. The Chronicler, in turn, relied on a version similar to the MT, which he expanded and clarified according to his own interpretive approach. In any case, this example, along with others discussed below, illustrates that the tendencies observed in the Book of Chronicles—such as the attempt to align historical narratives with the laws of the Torah—can already be discerned in the differences between the various versions of Kings.

**5.** **The Curtain (*Parokhet*) in Solomon’s Temple: LXX 6:36a**

While the examples I previously presented often show that the LXX version is shorter than the MT, there are instances where the LXX contains additional material not found in the MT. In the description of the Temple’s construction in chapters 6–7, for instance, the LXX includes an extra verse which has no equivalent in the MT, labeled as v. 36a in Rahlfs’ Septuagint edition: καὶ ᾠκοδόμησε καταπέτασμα τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ αἰλὰμ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ (“And he made[[28]](#footnote-29) the curtain of the court, the *ailam* of the house, which is before the shrine).[[29]](#footnote-30) In both the MT and LXX versions, this point marks the conclusion of one section and the start of a new topic. In the LXX, the additional verse 36a, often overlooked by commentators, serves as a kind of addendum.[[30]](#footnote-31)

However, even if this verse is a later addition, it is likely based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* for several key reasons.[[31]](#footnote-32) First, beyond the Hebraistic syntax reflected in the verse, it also includes the term αἰλαμ, which is an uncommon Greek word and appears to be a transliteration of the Hebrew word אולם (“porch”) in the Septuagint.[[32]](#footnote-33) Second, the use of the word καταπέτασμα (“curtain”), typically used in the Septuagint for פרכת, suggests a connection to the Hebrew text found in the corresponding passage in Chronicles.[[33]](#footnote-34) Verse 36a can be retroverted into Hebrew as follows: ויעש[[34]](#footnote-35) את פרכת החצר, אולם הבית, לפני ההיכל. Notably, the parallel account in Chronicles also mentions the making of a curtain, but with different details: “And he made the curtain (הפרכת) of blue and purple and crimson fabrics and fine linen, and worked cherubim into it” (2 Chr 3:14). This suggests that both texts may derive from a similar Hebrew tradition, or that each represents an independent addition stemming from a comparable exegetical approach.[[35]](#footnote-36)

The reference to the *parokhet* in both the LXX 3 Kingdoms and the Book of Chronicles appears to be an intentional effort to align Solomon’s Temple with the pentateuchal description of the Tabernacle, which contained a *parokhet* (Exod 26:31-33; 36:35-36). It is also plausible that these descriptions are connected to the presence of a *parokhet* in the Second Temple (e.g., Let. Aris. 86; 1 Macc 1:22; 11QT 7:13–14; Josephus, *J.W.* 212–214; Matt 27:51; Luke 23:45; *m*. Yoma 5:1–3; Tamid 7:1).[[36]](#footnote-37) The inclusion of the *parokhet* likely serves to establish continuity among three sacred institutions: the Tabernacle, Solomon’s Temple, and the Second Temple. Thus, this example highlights the significance of textual witnesses in revealing additions to the Temple chapters (1 Kgs 6–8), which were likely made to update the description of Solomon’s Temple in the spirit of the description of the Tabernacle in the Torah, and serve as an antecedent to Chronicles.

**6. Priestly-like Additions in Chapters 6–8 Attested in All Major Versions**

The cases discussed above were a group of texts written in P and H style that are absent from one of the major versions (MT or LXX) and are therefore clearly later additions. Nonetheless, in the account of the construction of Solomon’s Temple and bringing the ark to Jerusalem (1 Kgs / 3 Kgdms 6–8), there are, as noted above, additional texts that feature a Priestly style, but are documented in all the textual witnesses.

*6.1. Small Additions in Chapter 6–8*

Thus, the Priestly expression קדש הקדשים (“the holy of holies”) appears three times in the chapters describing Solomon’s Temple (1 Kings 6:16; 7:50; 8:6). This expression is frequently used in the Priestly source to denote the most sacred part of the Tabernacle—the place where the ark and cherubim are situated and where Moses communes with God “from above the ark-cover, from between the two cherubim” (Exod 25:22).[[37]](#footnote-38) In Kings, the inner sanctum is usually referred to as the דביר (1 Kgs 6:5, 16, 19–20, 31; 7:49; 8:6, 8). Solomon constructed this part of the Temple to house the ark (1 Kgs 6:19), placing two massive cherubim within it (1 Kgs 6:23).

The phrase קדש הקדשים (“holy of holies”) is twice attached in 1 Kings to the more frequent term in these chapters דביר (“inner sanctuary”). In 1 Kgs 6:16 ויבן לו מבית לדביר לקדש הקדשים (“and he built this within as an inner sanctuary, as the holy of holies”).[[38]](#footnote-39) In 1 Kgs 8: 6ויבאו הכהנים את ארון ברית יהוה אל מקומו אל דביר הבית אל קדש הקדשים (“the priests brought the ark of Yhwh’s covenant to its place in the inner sanctuary of the house, to the holy of holies”).[[39]](#footnote-40) The sense of redundancy and the smooth sequence obtained without the phrase קדש הקדשים (“holy of holies”) confirm that the latter was added at a secondary stage by a scribe who identified this part of Solomon’s Temple with the holy of holies of the Tabernacle. The phrase קדש הקדשים (“holy of holies”) appears one more time in these chapters, in 1 Kgs 7:50:והפתות לדלתות הבית הפנימי לקדש הקדשים לדלתי הבית להיכל זהב (“the sockets for the doors of the innermost part of the house, the holy of holies, and for the doors of the nave of the temple, of gold”).[[40]](#footnote-41) In this text, the phrase קדש הקדשים (“holy of holies”) doubles the expression הבית הפנימי (“the innermost part of the house”) and disrupts the sequence describing the doors. As previously noted, the term קדש הקדשים (“holy of holies”) is consistently documented in all major versions of Kings. It seems that this phrase was deliberately used in these texts to align the account of the Temple’s construction with the Pentateuchal traditions, thereby presenting the Solomonic Temple as a direct continuation of the Priestly Tabernacle.

A similar approach is evident in the Book of Chronicles. In instances where 1 Kings uses the term דביר (“inner sanctuary”), Chronicles replaces it with the more familiar Pentateuchal phrase, with a minor addition: בית קדש הקדשים (“the most holy house”). For example, 1 Kings 6:20 states וְלִפְנֵי **הַדְּבִיר** עֶשְׂרִים אַמָּה אֹרֶךְ (“The interior of *the inner sanctuary* was twenty cubits long”), while 2 Chronicles 3:8 reads וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת **בֵּית קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים** אָרְכּוֹ עַל פְּנֵי רֹחַב הַבַּיִת אַמּוֹת עֶשְׂרִים (“And he made *the most holy house*, its length, corresponding to the width of the house, was twenty cubits”). Similarly, 1 Kings 6:23 states וַיַּעַשׂ **בַּדְּבִיר** שְׁנֵי כְרוּבִים עֲצֵי שָׁמֶן (“In *the inner sanctuary* he made two cherubim of olivewood”), while 2 Chronicles 3:10 reads וַיַּעַשׂ **בְּבֵית קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים** כְּרוּבִים שְׁנַיִם מַעֲשֵׂה צַעֲצֻעִים (“And in *the most holy house* he made two cherubim of image work”).

*6.2. Bringing the Tent of Meeting into the Temple and the Entrance of the Kabod (1 Kgs 8:4, 10–11)*

Chapter 8 also contains more significant Priestly additions found across all major textual versions. As previously mentioned, the LXX version lacks the specific reference to the Levites carrying the ark, reflecting a shorter text. However, even in this abbreviated version of verse 4, the LXX still contain Priestly features. It recounts that, in addition to the ark being brought to Jerusalem, the Tent of Meeting and all the sacred vessels were also transported: “and the Tent of Meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the Tent of Meeting.” The style of 1 Kings 8:4 indicates that it was composed with an awareness of the Priestly style of the Pentateuch. The expression כלי הקדש (“the holy vessels”) found in this verse appears elsewhere only in the Priestly texts of the Pentateuch, and even there, only in the relatively later strata of these materials (Num 3:31; 4:15; 18:3; 31:6), or in Chronicles, which was influenced by the same texts (1 Chr 9:29; 2 Chr 5:5).

Rabbinic literature (*b*. Soṭah 9a) followed by several modern exegetes suggest that the Tent of Meeting was brought to Solomon’s Temple and placed within a designated area.[[41]](#footnote-42) However, aside from a single sentence in Samuel (2 Sam 2:22bβ)—which is likely a later addition—there is no prior mention in the Samuel or Kings narratives of the ark being placed in the Tent of Meeting, as described in the Pentateuch.[[42]](#footnote-43) In fact, the opposite is suggested: 2 Samuel 6 recounts the ark’s relocation to the city of David (from where Solomon is said to have brought it to the Temple), describing how David erected a *temporary* tent for the ark in Jerusalem: “They brought the ark of YHWH and set it in its place, inside the tent that David had pitched for it…” (2 Sam 6:17; cf. 7:2, 6).

If we read the narrative of bringing the ark to Solomon’s Temple—without the additions absent in the LXX and without verse 4, which contains explicitly Priestly terminology—it would resemble the pattern of the ark stories in Samuel (2 Sam 6:1–11, 12–19) and also serve to complete them.[[43]](#footnote-44) It appears that a late scribe, recounting the story of the ark’s transfer to the city of David (1 Kgs 8), identified the temporary tent mentioned in the Davidic narratives (2 Sam 6:17) with the Priestly Tent of Meeting. This scribe likely inserted the reference to the Tent of Meeting in 1 Kings 8:4, thereby creating a conceptual link between the Tabernacle and the Temple. As a result, Solomon’s Temple is portrayed as the direct continuation of the Tabernacle described in the Torah. This Priestly-like sentence in verse 4 was likely added before the branch of the LXX diverged, which is why they appear in all the major textual witnesses.

Chapter 8 contains another passage that can be attributed to the same scribe, who was influenced by the Priestly style and aimed to portray Solomon’s Temple as a continuation of the desert-era Tabernacle. This is the account of the events following the ark’s placement in the Temple (1 Kgs 8:10–11). While most commentaries and studies on Kings briefly acknowledge the Priestly-like character of this passage, they fail to provide a convincing explanation for its inclusion in the book of Kings.[[44]](#footnote-45) A comparison of this text with the parallel account of the ark being brought into the Tabernacle at the end of Exodus (40:34–35) suggests a clear dependence between these narratives:

TEXT

It could be argued that the Priestly description in the Pentateuch, often considered a later work, was shaped by the account of Solomon’s Temple. However, the distinctive Priestly language found in this passage—uncommon in Kings—suggests the opposite: that Kings was influenced by the Priestly account. For instance, the phrase כבוד יהוה (“the glory of YHWH”), which denotes the divine presence, is a distinctly Priestly term frequently found in P and Ezekiel but appears only once in Kings—in this passage.[[45]](#footnote-46) Furthermore, this account of the divine presence entering the Temple is not mentioned again in Kings. In fact, Solomon’s prayer (1 Kgs 8:22–53) repeatedly refers to God’s “dwelling place in the heavens,” which appears to directly contradict the idea of God’s presence residing in the Temple.[[46]](#footnote-47) The *Kabod* scene in the Book of Kings / Kingdoms has no continuation and does not form part of a complete narrative. In contrast, the parallel passage in Exodus seamlessly integrates into the Priestly narrative. After the completion of the Tabernacle, God’s presence—the *Kabod*—descends from Mount Sinai, enters the Tabernacle, and continues to accompany the people on their journey (Exod 40:34–35). When Moses is unable to enter the Tabernacle due to the overwhelming divine presence (Exod 40:35), Leviticus 1:1 picks up directly, recounting how YHWH calls to Moses from within the Tabernacle to deliver a series of ritual laws (Lev 1:1ff).[[47]](#footnote-48) It seems likely that a late scribe who copied 1 Kgs 8 inserted verses 10–11, and possibly most of verse 4, in the style of the Pentateuchal description, to create a connection between the construction and dedication of the Tabernacle in the desert and that of Solomon’s Temple.

This approach is further developed in Chronicles, where a parallel pericope to 1 Kgs 8:10–11 appears twice—first in the corresponding sequence after the ark is brought into the Temple (2 Chr 5:11–14) and again following Solomon’s prayer, with the added detail of fire descending from heaven (2 Chr 7:1–3). This latter detail clearly alludes to the Priestly narrative (cf. Lev 9:24).[[48]](#footnote-49)

It seems that the well-known approach found in the Book of Chronicles—revising the ancient historical narrative to align with Torah laws and incorporating Priestly language and terminology—can already be observed in the Book of Kings, in a series of additions that were likely introduced during the book’s development and transmission. In the case discussed in this section, a set of Priestly additions was made at a relatively early stage, before the main textual branches diverged. Consequently, these additions are present in all major versions.

*Conclusions*

It appears, therefore, that the description of Solomon's Temple in chapters 6–8 attracted not just one scribe, but several scribes who transmitted the scrolls of the Book of Kings. These scribes gradually incorporated a series of small additions in a Priestly style, referencing the tabernacle in the Torah. These additions seem to have been intended to create continuity between the two institutions and to present the Jerusalem Temple as a continuation of the tabernacle from the Priestly narrative. One layer of additions can be identified by comparing the differences between the MT and the LXX (MT 1 Kgs 6:11–14; LXX 3 Kgdms 6:36a; short additions in 1 Kgs 8:1–5, 65). Another layer of additions is evident in all the textual witnesses, likely introduced at an earlier stage before the divergence of the major textual traditions (minor additions in 1 Kgs 6:16; 7:50; 8:6; longer additions in 8:4, 10–11).

This form of rewriting, characterized by the use of priestly language and a profound engagement with Torah laws, is also known from the Book of Chronicles. This late book frequently addresses matters related to the Temple and cultic issues, drawing extensively from the literary and linguistic patterns of the Pentateuch, particularly the Priestly source, which plays a central role in it. For instance, the Chronicler’s account of Solomon’s Temple dedication is extensively reworked in the style and spirit of the Priestly description of the Tabernacle’s dedication. Chronicles recounts how fire descended from heaven to consume the burnt offering and sacrifices (2 Chr 7:1), and how all the people, witnessing the Glory of God as a manifestation of the divine presence, bowed down and gave thanks (2 Chr 7:3). This account, absent from the narrative in Kings, was undoubtedly added in Chronicles under the influence of the Tabernacle’s dedication story, which similarly concludes with fire falling from heaven (Lev 9:24). In this way, the Chronicler suggested a connection between the Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple, thereby reinforcing a sense of continuity between the two.

The Chronicler also introduced subtler changes, such as incorporating more familiar terminology from the Torah, akin to the terminological adjustments found in 1 Kgs 6–8. For instance, he twice replaced the term דביר from the Book of Kings with a new phrase he created, בית קדש הקדשים (“the most holy house”), blending Priestly terminology with a novel addition. He also mentions a *parokhet* (curtain) in Solomon’s Temple (2 Chr 3:14), similar to the addition found in the LXX 6:36a, thereby establishing a connection between the Tabernacle, Solomon’s Temple, and the *parokhet* in the Second Temple period.

Based on the evidence presented here, it appears that the techniques and methods of rewriting found in Chronicles did not emerge suddenly with the creation of this book but were preceded by a lengthy process of literary activity. This process can be traced through the variations in the different stages and versions of the Book of Kings. It is likely that this literary and scribal activity eventually culminated in the comprehensive rewriting that resulted in the Book of Chronicles.
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